

THE SOLICITATION CLOSING DATE OF THURSDAY, OCTOBER 10TH, 2013; 4:00 P.M., CENTRAL DAYLIGHT TIME (CDT), REMAINS UNCHANGED

The purpose of this Amendment is to answer Questions from prospective Offerors

SF 33

Since there are only 4 blocks for amendment acknowledgement on the SF 33 form itself, GSA will accept the amendment acknowledgement on the SF33 if you type or manually write "Amendments 01 through 06" and date it the date of this last amendment "09/24/2013" in only one of the blocks in Block 14 of the form. Please wait until the final amendment is issued prior to filling out the SF 33. GSA does not intend to issue any more amendments to the solicitation documents themselves (Section A through M) since all the Questions and Responses are binding; however, GSA may post additional amendments in the form of Questions and Responses only if they could potentially impact the preparation of proposals in response to the solicitation. Comments, recommendations, and other feedback received have been considered, but are not included.

SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO THE SOLICITATION

- For clarification purposes, a change to the numbering format in paragraph (b) of Section K.7. is revised. **NOTE:** A new electronic Section K is provided with this amendment with the numerical correction to Section K.7, paragraph (b); **however**, if an Offeror has already completed Section K and does not want to fill out the revised Section K, this is allowable since Question #5 and the response below is binding under the solicitation.
- Section M.5.1.10, Mission Space #4 (Natural Resources) is revised to add the following:
"6. Tennessee Valley Authority"
- No other changes were made to the Solicitation, including all the Section J attachments.

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

OASIS SMALL BUSINESS (SB) SOLICITATION ONLY:

1. **Question:** Section H.15.1. Lateral Pool Ramping. This clause indicates that if a contractor outgrows the size of the small business pool and can no longer certify as a small business under the size standard of the pool, that contractor may elect to be considered for other pools. Would the Government indicate that to be recertified as a small business under other pools the contractor would be required to provide two (2) projects under the NAICS code of the pool the contractor wants to be certified as a small business? If so, the requirement to have two projects under the specified NAICS code may make lateral pool ramping very challenging, if not impossible. Therefore, for lateral pool ramping, would the Government remove the requirement for having two projects under the specified NAICS codes?

Response: Legally, we cannot do that. What we are doing when we "on-ramp" is to re-open the original solicitation. In order to legally do that, the original standards must be applied to the follow on awards. Given that OASIS SB awardees have 5 years to plan for growth and take the necessary steps to qualify for a different Pool, we don't necessarily see this as challenging as it otherwise might be.

2. **Question:** Section H.3.1. Set-Asides Based on Socio-Economic Group. Subject to having at least three responsible small business concerns within a specific socio-economic group under the corresponding NAICS Pool, allows the OCO to set-aside Task Orders to a specific socio-economic group or socio-economic groups. We believe that this approach may put small businesses, who do not belong to any of the specified socio-economic groups, who are awarded a BPA under the corresponding NAICS Pool, at a significant disadvantage. Therefore, under Clause H.11. Partnering, would the Government allow selected small businesses who do not belong to any specific socio-economic group to form Contractor Teaming Arrangements developed under the GSA CTA rules at least to compete for the Task Orders under the corresponding NAICS Pool; if not all small business set-aside pools?

Response: That recommendation is not in accordance with law or regulation and cannot be implemented. Furthermore, BPAs cannot be awarded under FAR Part 16 ordering procedures.

3. **Question:** The current requirement states that the "Project must have exceeded the Simplified Acquisition Threshold in total award value". Given the minimum project value for Primary Projects in section L.5.3 has been lowered to \$150,000.00 annually and that Primary Projects can also be Secondary Projects for Relevant Experience with Mission spaces; can you confirm that projects for this section to support Relevant Experience with Mission Spaces can be equal to or exceed the Simplified Acquisition Threshold?

Response: Confirmed.

PROPOSAL SUBMISSION:

4. **Question:** Regarding, Proposal Due Date and Time: How early can offerors submit proposals, and if submitting prior to 10 October, is there a need to contact the Government POCs prior to doing so?"

Response: Send your proposal in accordance with the solicitation instructions. There is no need to contact us prior to doing so. Although GSA cannot predict if additional amendments in the form of Questions and Responses will be posted, GSA does not anticipate issuing any amendments within the week prior to the solicitation closing date unless absolutely necessary. Offerors may submit proposals at any time prior to the solicitation closing date; however, Offerors must ensure the SF 33 accounts for all the amendments issued prior to submitting your proposal.

SECTION K:

5. **Question:** K.7 FAR 52.219-1 Small Business Program Representations. The way section K.7, paragraph (b) has been re-written from the original FAR clause there is no way a small business can represent itself as any of the following socioeconomic groups in the follow on paragraphs regarding socioeconomic groups unless they are a small business with a size standard under \$14M under Pool 1 since all the following questions refer to paragraph (b)(1), Pool 1. Please advise if this how you want your SB socioeconomic groups only represented from meeting POOL 1 criteria.

Response: No. Offerors must represent your socioeconomic group for ALL pools being applied for, not just for Pool 1. To correct this error in the numbering system, Section K.7., paragraph (b), is revised as follows:

From:

(b) Representations.

- (1) The Offeror represents as part of its offer that it ☐ is, ☐ is not a small business concern under POOL 1
- (2) The Offeror represents as part of its offer that it ☐ is, ☐ is not a small business concern under POOL 2
- (3) The Offeror represents as part of its offer that it ☐ is, ☐ is not a small business concern under POOL 3
- (4) The Offeror represents as part of its offer that it ☐ is, ☐ is not a small business concern under POOL 4
- (5) The Offeror represents as part of its offer that it ☐ is, ☐ is not a small business concern under POOL 5.A.
- (6) The Offeror represents as part of its offer that it ☐ is, ☐ is not a small business concern under POOL 5.B.
- (7) The Offeror represents as part of its offer that it ☐ is, ☐ is not a small business concern under POOL 6

To:

(b) (1) Representations.

- The Offeror represents as part of its offer that it ☐ is, ☐ is not a small business concern under POOL 1
- The Offeror represents as part of its offer that it ☐ is, ☐ is not a small business concern under POOL 2
- The Offeror represents as part of its offer that it ☐ is, ☐ is not a small business concern under POOL 3
- The Offeror represents as part of its offer that it ☐ is, ☐ is not a small business concern under POOL 4
- The Offeror represents as part of its offer that it ☐ is, ☐ is not a small business concern under POOL 5.A.
- The Offeror represents as part of its offer that it ☐ is, ☐ is not a small business concern under POOL 5.B.
- The Offeror represents as part of its offer that it ☐ is, ☐ is not a small business concern under POOL 6

SYSTEMS, CERTIFICATIONS, AND CLEARANCES:

6. **Question:** Reference: Forward Pricing Rate Agreements, Forward Pricing Rate Recommendations, and/or Approved Billing Rates. Your requirement for this has been very clear since the original RFP and continues through the most amendments of the Solicitation: the offeror must provide current (underlined) verification. However, a recent amendment states that the government will accept a Forward Pricing Rate Proposal (FPRP) which has been submitted to DCAA. This response is a major change from and contradiction to the consistent intent conveyed by the government so far not only for L.5.5.2 but also for L.5.5.1 through L.5.5.4. Respectfully submit that your reversal on a key stand so close to the submission date is unfair. Either the government reissue the entire RFP as Amendment 05 to draw attention to this important change and allow more time for companies to submit FPRPs, or change its response to questions 15 and 16 in the most recent amendment. We further request and seek clarification that the government will not change its stand on other certifications including those in L.5.5.1 through L.5.5.4. Your changing your stand from verification to proposal is a game changer at this late stage, and the government either return to its original stand (preferred option), or sufficiently extend the due date to allow all qualified companies to submit the proposals to DCAA or DCMA. Small businesses such as ours have limited bandwidth, and while we are ready for the audits, given the time line needed to obtain verification, we had decided to focus on the OASIS response instead. If proposals are now acceptable, we will be happy to submit our compliant proposals for the audits, knowing we will be certified - but request time to submit them.

Response: There has been no change to the requirements in Sections L.5.5.1. through L.5.5.4. Do not submit a Forward Pricing Rate Proposal to GSA. GSA is not giving any points just for a Forward Pricing Rate Proposal (FPRP) in of itself. To clarify, if an Offeror does not have a Forward Pricing Rate Agreement (FPRA) or Forward Pricing Rate

Recommendation (FPRR) but, submitted a FPRP to their Cognizant Federal Auditor (CFA) and their CFA has a formal letter of approval of those rates in the context of "Approved Billing Rates", then the Offeror can submit the CFA letter of the Approved Billing Rates with your proposal and that would count as points in accordance with the Section's L.5.5.2. and M.6.

7. **Question:** Section L.5.5.2 states "*Verification requirements include a copy of the Offeror's official FPRA, FPRR, Approved Billing Rates, audit report and audit report number from DCAA, DCMA, or CFA identifying the rates in the FPRA, FPRR, and/or Approved Billing Rates*" – DCMA has provided the current year's letter provisionally approving Offeror's Forward Billing Rates for the current year while DCAA's audit is in process and an audit report does not yet exist for the current year. A FPRR and audit report was provided for the prior year. Would a Government-issued letter from one of the listed agencies provisionally approving the offeror's forward billing rates and the previous year's audit report satisfy this requirement?

Response: Yes.

8. **Question:** Aside from a single-page Certificate of Registration from an ISO registrar (without clearly-delineated paragraphs) as proof of an ISO 9001:2008 certification, it is uncertain what letter or certification is required, particularly when discussing page and paragraph numbers. Does GSA require evidence aside from the formal Certificate of Registration?

Response: No. The formal Certificate of Registration is fine.

9. **Question:** Will a DCMA letter providing final determination status fulfill the requirement to provide the approved accounting system audit report document for the OASIS proposal?

Response: Yes.

10. **Question:** There does not appear to be a requirement for a copy of the facility clearance, has that requirement been removed from the proposal?

Response: That is correct. Please just indicate facility clearance level on the Proposal Checklist and Self Scoring Worksheet. We have means to validate this element without any further documentation submission.

11. **Question:** The government is clear that points are allowed for only one certification in each category/standard under M.6. scoring. Will the Government consider amending L.5.5.6. – L.5.5.9 to include the same language as is in L.5.5.5 with the following suggested edits; "If an Offeror has multiple [REPLACE WITH APPROPRIATE STANDARD HERE] certifications, the Offeror shall only receive points for One (1) certification and must provide the certification that the Offeror wants to be credited for and wishes to maintain in accordance with Section H.6.11."

Response: Confirmed. For each individual certification category under Sections L.5.5.5. through L.5.5.9, if an Offeror multiple certifications, the Offeror shall only receive points for One (1) certification and must provide the certification that the Offeror wants to be credited for and wishes to maintain in accordance with Section H.6.11.

MISSION SPACES:

12. **Question:** Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), does not fall under the Department of Energy, but is a corporation of the U.S. Government and the nation's largest public energy provider. TVA is not included in the Mission Space 4 Natural Resources list, please confirm TVA can be considered under Mission Space 4.

Response: Confirmed. Section M.5.1.10, Mission Space #4 (Natural Resources) is revised to add the following:
“6. Tennessee Valley Authority”

SECTION C SCOPE OF WORK:

13. **Question:** The solicitation indicates that OASIS is limited to the procurement of professional services (e.g., Section C.2 and C.5). Does GSA agree that the inclusion of NAICS code 541330, Engineering Services, in the OASIS solicitation is intended only for the procurement of A&AS and SETA (systems engineering and technical assistance) types of engineering work and excludes of the use of 541330 for the procurement of engineering services in support of base and range operations and maintenance services where the predominance of work is in non-professional services?

Response: Requirements where the predominance of work is non-professional services may not be performed under OASIS regardless of NAICS code, description, or label associated with the requirement. The fundamental qualifying criteria for work to be performed on OASIS is that the work is predominantly for professional labor and the requirement contains one or more of the OASIS Core Disciplines as defined in Section C of the contract.

PAST PERFORMANCE:

14. **Question:** RFP Sections L.5.3.1 (para 4, #2), and L.5.4 (bullets 3 and 6). Please insert into Section L.5.3.1, paragraph 4, #2 on page 111 option “c”, a completed J8 Past Performance Survey. This will ensure alignment with all other past performance references of the RFP.

Response: Under Section L.5.3.1., #2.c. to clarify: “Each project must have at least one year of performance unless one of the following situation exist.” In order of precedence: If a CPARS has been done on a completed project with less than one year of performance provide that. If a CPARS has not been done but, an Award Fee Determination has been done on a project with less than one year of performance, provide that. If neither a CPARS nor Award Fee Determination has been done on a project with less than one year of performance, then provide a Section J.8. Past Performance Survey. **Please keep in mind, for projects with less than one year of performance, they must be complete.** For example, a project started on February 1, 2012 and was completed on September 30, 2012. This is allowed if a CPARS, Award Fee Determination, or a Past Performance Survey was done to cover the period of performance of February 1, 2012 through the completion date of September 30, 2012.

15. **Question:** Please confirm that an ongoing project with less than one year of performance qualifies as a Primary Project if a J.8 Past Performance Survey is completed under a “bridge contract” which is follow-on work for a contract we have held for 20 years. We are in the initial period of performance of the bridge and during this bridge period of time the master contract is being re-awarded.

Response: You had a previous contract for these services, that contract expired, and now you are performing a new bridge contract that is currently ongoing, but less than a year old and not yet complete. Given the situation, you could use the previous contract as a relevant experience project, but not the bridge. See response to Question 14 above. You could potentially use both the expired contract and bridge contract for Pool Qualification, however.

16. **Question:** Please confirm a task order, used as part of the “collection task orders” under a single award IDIQ can be used if the performance period is less than a year but is ongoing, without attachment 8 being completed and with no CPARS, providing Attachment 8, CPARS, etc. is completed at the IDIQ level of the contract.

Response: A collection of task orders includes all task orders awarded under a Single-Award IDIQ or BPA. There must be at least a cumulative year of performance on the IDIQ or BPA itself, but the requirements do not apply to the individual task orders. Past Performance may be provided at the IDIQ or BPA level **IF** the past performance considers

task order performance for each of the core disciplines taking credit for. If the IDIQ or BPA level past performance rating does not consider the task order performance, then individual task order past performance needs to be provided for the task orders identified as demonstrating the core disciplines only. Again, in order of precedence, whether it's applicable at the IDIQ/BPA level or the task order level, CPARS, Award Fee Determination, or Past Performance Surveys.

17. **Question:** Now that there is no maximum number of task orders to be submitted under the Single Award IDIQ Primary Project 5 Alternate entry, does every task order that gets submitted for the Project 5 Alternate need to have a CPARS, AF Determination, or Past Performance rating form submitted for it as well?

Response: There is no limit to the amount of task orders to be submitted under a Single-Award IDIQ or BPA up to the maximum amount of points being claimed. Once the maximum amount of points being claimed are accounted for and achieved, providing additional task orders serves no purpose. However, past performance for Task Orders under Single-Award IDIQ or BPA is limited to the number of Core Disciplines being claimed. For example, an Offeror is claiming they have met 5 out of 6 Core Disciplines covered under a Single-Award IDIQ. That could be obtained by having all 5 Core Disciplines performed under 1 Task Order OR a separate Core Discipline being performed under 5 separate Task Orders. There must be past performance for each Task Order that corresponds to each Core Discipline being claimed. If a Task Order is submitted to acquire other points not related to Core Disciplines, past performance is not required for that Task order. If past performance for Task Orders is documented at the Single-Award IDIQ or BPA level, that is also acceptable as long as the past performance covers, at a minimum, all the Task Orders with each Core Discipline being claimed.

18. **Question:** If an Offeror plans to submit as a small business in one pool and a large business in another pool utilizing the same relevant experience primary projects, can we use the same completed Past Performance Rating Form for both the SB and Large submissions?

Response: Yes.

POOL QUALIFICATION:

19. **Question:** There are also some situations where a single principal NAICS code is applied to an entire large, complex task order or contract, and specific efforts are not assigned separate, unique NAICS codes. For example, space vehicle research and development may be a significant effort performed on a larger, complex and overarching task order assigned the single NAICS code 541330—Engineering Services. That effort, however, would be clearly relevant to, and would qualify under, the "Research and Development in Space Vehicles" 54172 Exception C NAICS code had it been performed as a separate or individual task order. In those situations, will GSA also consider an alternative means of substantiating that projects involve relevant experience, such as: (a) correspondence from a warranted contracting officer to identify the NAICS codes that are applicable to the specific efforts; or (b) a description of the work and a statement by the offeror regarding which NAICS codes would otherwise be applicable to those efforts?

Response: No. Each award has a single NAICS code and a single PSC Code. Any requirement may include a number of different types of work, but the NAICS code and PSC Code represents the preponderance of the work. We are not evaluating "secondary" or "alternative" NAICS or PSC Codes. For pool qualification purposes, Offerors must have performed (at least 2 projects for OASIS SB and at least 3 projects for OASIS unrestricted) where the preponderance of work matches a NAICS or PSC code assigned to the corresponding Pool being applied for. The only time we should receive correspondence from a Contracting Officer is when the NAICS Code or PSC Code that was reported in FPDS-NG and contractual documents was reported incorrectly and the Contracting Officer is correcting the record or, in cases when the NAICS Code or PSC Code was not identified in FPDS-NG and contractual documents and the Contracting Officer is notifying us what the actual NAICS Code or PSC Code was used for that project.

20. **Question:** Please confirm that “further evidence to support the Exception(s)...such as the “Statement of Work)” is not required for pools 3, 5A, 5B and 6 if the respective pool qualification project has the appropriate PSC code in FPDS-NG regardless of the NAICS code indicated. For example, if a pool qualification project for Pool 5B has an FPDS-NG record that indicates PSC code AR34 (R&D- Space: Flight) and NAICS code 541330, would this project be considered as acceptable without any further evidence or documentation of work performed in Exception C?

Response: Confirmed.

21. **Question:** Please confirm that if we are submitting a project to qualify for Pool 3 Exception A, a contract award document (i.e., SF1449) clearly showing NAICS Code 541330 and business size standard of \$35.5M (or previous Exception size standard of \$27M) is sufficient documentation.

Response: For Pool 3, provide verification of the NAICS code and client office. If the NAICS code is 541330 and it was issued for a military organization that is sufficient. We are not concerned with the size standard used.

22. **Question:** Please clarify that if a past performance project’s NAICS code does not match one of the codes listed in any of the pools, the company is not eligible to bid? Example: If the Offeror is submitting a proposal under Pool 1 and they have a current contract that falls under NAICS code 561110, but that code is not listed under Pool 1, then we do not qualify to bid?

Response: Pool qualifiers are based on NAICS codes or PSC codes. On OASIS SB, Offerors must have performed 2 projects that correspond to either one of these codes assigned to the Pool being applied for. On OASIS unrestricted Offerors must have performed 3 projects that correspond to either one of these codes assigned to the Pool being applied for.

PLACES OF PERFORMANCE:

23. **Question:** This question is regarding performance locations. Our contract SOW says the location will be specified by Agency, so when we are performing the contract, COR or Government Manger will specify a location for us to work during the contract which will not be predefined in contract. How can we prove the locations? It will be impossible for CO to come out a letter since the CO was no longer found. Will COR or agency manager’s letter be enough to prove the locations?

Response: Places of performance need to be identified in “contractual related documents”, whether it’s in the contract itself, a technical direction memo issued from the COR, or any other formal contractual related document. If not in any formal contractual related documents, then Places of Performance need to be clarified by the Contracting Officer by letter or email. Clarifying contractual matters need to come solely from the Contracting Officer assigned to the project. .

24. **Question:** Does the government consider home offices or telecommuting in different MSAs as acceptable locations for multiple locations?

Response: No. Home offices and/or telecommuting do not count as acceptable places of performance.

MEANINGFUL RELATIONSHIPS:

25. **Question:** It is our understanding that GSA desires a single bid from within a corporate structure and therefore allows offerors to utilize resources from a parent company, affiliate, division, and/or subsidiary to meet the OASIS evaluation elements through the Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter(s). Our assumption is that during performance of

individual task orders, these other affiliated legal entities would have a "direct order, direct bill" relationship with OASIS end users, allowing them to receive direct awards from Government agencies thereby establishing privity of contact with that affiliated legal entity. This approach is consistent with GSA's use of Contractor Team Arrangements (CTA) under the Federal Supply Schedule program at FAR 8.404 & 8.405. Is this assumption correct?

Response: No, the assumption is not correct. All resultant task orders shall be in the name of the Offeror only. This procurement is not a schedule and does not fall under FAR Part 8.

26. **Question:** Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters (MRCL). Our company owns approx. 8+ wholly-owned subsidiaries under common control or the parent company. Please confirm a separate MRCL is not required for each of the wholly-owned subsidiaries.

Response: That depends. If your company is using projects and/or resources (systems, certifications, and clearances) from those subsidiaries as part of your proposal submission, a MRCL must be provided for each subsidiary referenced. An alternative way would be to provide a single MRCL that identifies any and all subsidiaries identified and specifies the role and commitment they will contribute towards the performance of task orders.

27. **Question:** Regarding the Government's response to Question 73 (Amendment 03 OASIS and Amendment 04 OASIS SB): Given that Responses are incorporated into the Solicitation by reference, will the Government be issuing an Amendment confirming that a Joint Venture qualifies as an affiliate to include use as Relevant Experience for the Prime Contractor, making this change to paragraphs L.5.1.9 and L.5.3?

Response: No. Answering the question and officially posting it is sufficient.

28. **Question:** Concerning the Government's response to question #73, the reference to L.5.1.9 of the subject solicitation MRCLs is sufficiently addressed; however, please confirm that since the Offeror has ownership and control of a JV, the Offeror may use a Relevant Experience Project from the Joint Venture using the J.7 OASIS Relevant Experience Primary Template.

Response: Confirmed.

29. **Question:** Please confirm the acceptability of a Relevant Experience project from a joint venture as long as the Offeror has greater than 50% ownership and control of the joint venture. The answer to question 73 of the Amendment 3 Questions and Answers states "If the Offeror has ownership and control of a JV, the Offeror may use a Relevant Experience Project from the Joint Venture provided that a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter is provided that clearly articulates how that affiliate will be utilized in the performance of task orders under OASIS/OASIS SB." This guidance is not reflected Section L.5.1.9 of the solicitation and may be more appropriately addressed in Section 5.3. Please clarify.

Response: We have already confirmed this. The answer is a clarification of what is considered an affiliate as defined in Section L.5.1.9.

INDIVIDUAL PROJECT VALUE:

30. **Question:** Please confirm for a 'collection of task orders' in a Single Award IDIQ, that a task order whose value is less than (\$150,000 for OASIS SB or \$3M for OASIS unrestricted) can be included as one of the six tasks in the Single-Award IDIQ.

Response: A collection of task orders includes ALL task orders issued under that single-award IDIQ as a single project. The limit of six task orders only applies to identification of core disciplines and potentially, past performance. For all other matters, including value, all task orders may be used to maximize total points.

31. **Question:** "Annual project value for ongoing projects is determined as follows: total estimated value (inclusive of all option periods) divided by the total number of months of performance (inclusive of all option periods) multiplied by 12." Does the government want substantiation for current obligated dollars in addition to the total estimated value?

Response: If the project is ongoing, we only need validation of the total estimated value.

32. **Question:** For completed IDIQ contracts, would the Government allow using a subset of task orders to calculate the total contract value?

Response: If using an IDIQ as a relevant experience project under Project 5 Alternate, all task orders placed under it may be used to calculate total contract value.

33. **Question:** Will the annualized total contract value of a completed task order with a period of performance less than one year equal the total contract value for the task order? Example: 6 month task order for \$5 million has an annualized total contract value of \$5 million. Is this correct?

Response: That is correct.

MERGERS, ACQUISITIONS, NOVATIONS, AND CHANGE-OF-NAME AGREEMENTS:

34. **Question:** Section L.3.2. only provides for Change-of-Name Agreements in the instance of an acquisition or contract novation. Our company will not have been acquired, nor will we be experiencing a Government approved novation of a U.S. Federal contract from one Contractor to another. We do however have a Change-of-Name related to a separate legitimate circumstance. Would the government please confirm that any transaction resulting in a Change-of-Name should be addressed in the same manner as outlined in Section L.3.2. of the current OASIS solicitation?

Response: Confirmed.

35. **Question:** A Change-of-Name is prescribed for Volumes 1 and 3 (V1 Sections L.5.1.2. and L.3.2.; V3 Sections L.5.3.1. through L.5.3.2.8. and L.3.2, Sections L.5.3.3.1. and L.3.2.; Sections L.5.3.3.2. and L.3.2.). Since verification documents are also required for Volumes 4, and 5 (Past Performance verification documents for Mission Spaces and Multiple Award IDIQ's & for Systems, Certifications and Facility Clearances) that will require a Change-of-Name agreement to explain why these verification documents appear under our previous company name, we request that the government confirm that a single Change-of-Name document can be produced and referenced in the Table Of Contents (TOC) for each volume. This file would use the prescribed SF30 with attachments containing "other verifiable documentation" for our Corporate name change. We would include this file under proposal element L.5.1.2 and title it using the governments preferred naming convention (e.g. ABC.VOL1.A.pdf) with the exception of excluding a specific proposal element (e.g. PQ, REPP, RESP, etc.) so that this single file could be used for multiple elements. Additionally, we would include this file in the Table of Contents (TOC) for each volume and reference it in the footer of each document provided to refer evaluators back to the Volume 1 file for any element that requires this Change-Of-Name verification. QUESTION: Please confirm this is acceptable or provide alternative instructions to adequately address our circumstance.

Response: Confirmed.

SINGLE-AWARD IDIQ or BPA TASK ORDER CONTRACTS:

36. **Question:** Our Single Award IDIQ contract has hundreds of task orders won since contract inception. Are we required to list all task order contract numbers and provide the corresponding task order award cover pages, or are we allowed to just provide the minimum number of task order contract numbers and associated award pages that would maximize the scoring elements, i.e. annual award value?

Response: You only need submit the number required to earn the scoring element being claimed.

37. **Question:** This is the only Project 5 Alternate section where it appears more than six (6) task orders can be utilized. We want to confirm that we do not have to show ALL task orders, just the minimum necessary, as noted in the Question 4 comments in the "RELEVANT EXPERIENCE PROJECT 5 ALTERNATE - BACKGROUND INFORMATION" section ("Note: The Offeror need only to provide the Task Orders that meet the minimum requirements and maximizes the total number of additional points, if any").

Response: Please be aware that only ONE of the relevant experience projects provided may be a collection of task orders under a single-award IDIQ or single-award BPA. For all scoring elements, you only need to submit as much as necessary to earn the amount of points being claimed.

38. **Question:** There are cases where under a single award IDIQ contract where the Government client under our single award IDIQ contract makes successive single year task orders for the same project, rather than award a single task order with exercisable option years. This scenario appears to fully meet the intent of OASIS REPP qualification requirement, and note that in this case we are not referring to Alternative Project 5, which "at the offeror's discretion" can be a collection of task orders for multiple projects under the single award contract, but rather a single project awarded over successive years. As the Government defines the experience as "Projects", and in order to assess the capability/performance through the full period of performance a contractor worked on a "project", in REPPs 1 through 4 will the Government permit the use of successive single year task order awards for services on the same project, so long as it is clear (through Government documentation) that the successively awarded task orders represented in the REPP are for work on the same project?

Response: The answer is No. This would qualify as a "collection of task orders", but not a single project.

SUBCONTRACTING/TEAMING:

39. **Question:** Do 1099's/Consultants count as subcontractors?

Response: Yes

40. **Question:** Would the Government please confirm that if a contract/Task Order includes (less than three (3) Subcontractors/Teaming Partners for OASIS SB or less than four (4) Subcontractors/Teaming Partners for OASIS unrestricted), the Offerors are not to submit any documentation?

Response: Confirmed.

41. **Question:** Similarly, would the Government please confirm if there is more than three (3) Subcontractors/Teaming Partners on a contract/Task Order, Offerors are to submit information only on 3 entities?

Response: Confirmed.

CORE DISCIPLINES:

42. **Question:** Section J.7, Attachment (7) Relevant Experience (Primary) Project Template; Relevant Experience Project – Scoring Related Information; Question 3: This question on the template asks, “Which CORE DISCIPLINES were performed on the project?” The Note under this section requires the Offeror to provide excerpts of Contract or Task Order documentation that substantiate the Core Disciplines performed in Volume 3 of the proposal submission. Work performed on our significant contract is classified. Therefore, we would not be able to provide excerpts of this contract's documentation to substantiate the Core Disciplines performed under this contract. Therefore, would the Government contact the client directly for the scope of work and any other required documents for a classified contract/Task Order project in order to substantiate the rationale, and allow the Offeror to indicate this where applicable for each of the Core Disciplines checked under question 3 of the Relevant Experience Project – Scoring Related Information section in the Relevant Experience (Primary) Project Template?

Response: No. We cannot rely on anyone's interpretation of core discipline performance other than the evaluation team. For practically any other evaluation element, we can accept a CO's verification for, but for core disciplines, we cannot. Please try to get a redacted version of the documents that could be released and submitted with your proposal.

ANCILLARY SERVICES:

43. **Question:** If ancillary services within the scope of the work effort, but not specifically defined, were subcontracted to another organization or consultant, what documentation would be required to substantiate to receive additional points?

Response: Any services performed need to be defined somewhere within the SOW, work instruction, technical direction, or some other official documentation.

SECTION J.7 TEMPLATE:

44. **Question:** Please confirm or correct -- the Project Template J7 contains ALL the necessary information for ALL five projects and needs be filled only once, rather than once-per-project. That is - If submitting five projects, only one copy of a filled J7 is required with information on all five projects in the one document, not five J7's.

Response: Confirmed

COST/PRICE:

45. **Question:** Section L.6.3, Cost/Price Template Instructions: Page 127 of the RFP asks that “All percentages and rates shall be rounded to two decimal places.” We plan to display 2 decimal places IAW the RFP, but have the rate application IAW our FPRR calculate using our full rates (up to five decimal places). Will this be acceptable?

Response: Yes

PROPOSAL FORMAT TABLE

46. **Question:** In regard to Volume 3, L.5.3.1- L.5.3.8, Relevant Experience (Primary) Projects. Each file may include a variety of contract documentation necessary to show we have met the minimum requirements and each scoring element being claimed. We believe that a tab divider page between each type of contract document within each of the files ABC.VOL3.REPP.CD.P1 (thru .P5) that only specifies the name of the contract document would simplify GSA's review of these records. Would use of a tab divider in this manner be acceptable?

Response: Yes. Any reasonable approach to submitting the documentation is generally acceptable so long as the approach is clear and easy to understand. If there is a reasonable doubt that the methodology is not self-evident, then we recommend inclusion of a Table of Contents that clarifies the methodology. Our primary concern is making sure the content is included and that we can reasonably ascertain what documentation is being provided in support of what pass/fail or scoring element.

47. **Question:** I noticed the in the Proposal Format table has a Table of Contents only for Volume 1. However, the naming convention contains a volume reference, so I'm going to assume that you prefer a separate Table of Contents in each volume folder. I also assume that, if someone didn't notice this, it wouldn't be a deal killer if they provided one complete TOC.

Response: We've got no deal killers when it comes to file naming and tables of contents. We think we've provided sufficient leeway for Offerors to send us a comprehensible offer. All we are really concerned about is making sure we have what we need to validate proposals.

48. **Question:** Should the offeror identify the "verifiable documentation" by listing the references to the right of the "Yes" and "No" boxes or would you prefer the offeror insert a statement there referring the reviewer to the relevant sections of the "SCORING RELATED INFORMATION"?

Response: The documents should be included in Volume 3 in accordance with Section L.4. Offerors may also identify documents in a Table of Contents if they so desire.